

**REMARKS**

This amendment responds to the office action dated June 22, 2005.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Buckley et al., U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0049079 A1. As noted by the Examiner, Buckley et al. disclose answering an incoming call in response to interaction at a user interface, i.e. flipping a switch at a user interface, either on the headset or the handset. With the headset connected, if the incoming call answered on the headset, then the audio is automatically routed to the headset. See, paragraph 24. With the headset connected, if the incoming call answered on the handset, then the audio is automatically routed to the handset. See, paragraph 25. With the headset connected, if the incoming call answered on handset, and following that the control on the headset is activated, then the audio transfers from the handset to the headset. See, paragraph 26. With the headset connected, if the incoming call is answered on the headset, and following that the control on the handset is activated, then audio transfer from the headset to the handset. See, paragraph 27. Where no headset is connected the audio routes to the handset. See, paragraph 29. In all situations when a headset is used, the user is affirmatively required to activate a control on the headset or activate a control on the handset in order to answer a call and route the audio to the desired location.

Claim 1 has been amended to patentably distinguish over Buckley et al. by claiming connecting to the incoming call in response to an interaction by the user at the user interface to direct audio from the incoming call to the selectively connectable voice interface, if the connection state is connected; and if the connection state is disconnected, connecting to the incoming call to direct audio from the incoming call to the selectively connectable voice interface, in response to a change in the connection state of the selectively connectable voice interface from being disconnected to being connected free from an interaction by the user causing the change in the connection state.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Buckley, et al. and Ishida, U.S. Patent No. 6,195,570 B1. Ishida discloses that a call may be terminated upon disconnection of a headset and a menu screen thereafter displayed

Appl. No. 10/074,480  
Amdt. dated September 22, 2005  
Reply to Office action of June 22, 2005

on a user interface. The Examiner contends that the termination of a call is would "alert" the user that the headset was disconnected.

Claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Buckley et al. and Ishida by claiming initiating the call in response to a command at the user interface where audio from the call is directed to the selectively connectable voice interface, if the connection state of the selectively connectable voice interface is disconnected further alerting the user of the disconnected state and awaiting the connected state before completing the initiating then call without reinitiating the call.

Ishida does not teach the step of "alerting" the user of the disconnected state together with awaiting the connected state before completing the initiated call without reinitiating the call. In other words, Ishida teaches the termination of the call, as noted by the Examiner, and hence the combination would require reinitiating of the entire call after the call was terminated.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 2 and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 2.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kevin L. Russell  
Reg. No. 38,292  
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631